UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/620,067	07/14/2003	Robert Douglas Christiansen	100204030-1	7123

22879 7590 04/14/2010

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
3404 E. Harmony Road
Mail Stop 35
FORT COLLINS, CO 80528

EXAMINER	
KASSA, HILINA S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2625	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
04/14/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM
ipa.mail@hp.com
laura.m.clark@hp.com

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Application Number: 10/620,067
Filing Date: July 14, 2003
Appellant(s): CHRISTIANSEN, ROBERT DOUGLAS

Michael Dryja
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 01/18/2010 appealing from the Office action mailed 10/19/2009.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-22 are pending.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6,035,103	Zuber	5-2000
6,362,828	Morgan	3-2002

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-4, 6-18 and 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by **Zuber** (US Patent Number 6,035,103).

Regarding claim 1: As shown in figures 1 and 12, Zuber discloses a networked computing environment including a Raster Image Process (RIP) manager coupled to at least one RIP engine (**10, 12, 14, 16, figure 1, column 5, lines 14-24; note that the workstations are connected in a network with the print engines**), a method for the RIP manager to automatically configure the RIP engine (**column 14, lines 37-43; note that the parser is able to sequentially output data to the print engines as needed**), the method comprising:

receiving a print job (**column 5, lines 30-31; note that a print job is received**); and

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 15, lines 50-60; note that when the print job has parameters as color/B&W and according to the parameter, the job router/parser routes the print job to the accorded configured print engine per the preference**), the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to different portions as desired to process by the color or B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 2: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the at least one RIPing parameter is a RIPing algorithm, a resource/software

version, a particular font, or a color profile (**column 15, lines 52-58; note that the RIPing parameter includes color profile i.e. color/B&W**).

Regarding claim 3: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1: wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first (**356-362, figure 12, column 15, lines 63-64; note that the B&W job is routed to the first engine**) and second RIP engines in a pipeline (**358, 366, figure 12, column 15, lines 64-65; note that the color jobs are routed to the color processing engine**); wherein the first and second RIP engines are heterogeneous with respect to one another (**figure 12, column 15, lines 63-65; note that the two virtual engines are heterogeneous with respect to each other**); and

wherein requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration is further directed to configuring the first RIP engine to process the particular portion using same RIPing parameters as used by the second RIP engine to RIP a different portion of the print job (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to different portions as desired to process by the color or B&W engine, note that the RIPing parameter is color profile i.e. both engines are using the same parameter**).

Regarding claim 4: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises downloading, by the RIP engine, any configuration resource(s) indicated by RIP manager supplied processing preference(s)

that are not locally available to the RIP engine (**column 31, lines 34-48; note that color mapped values are downloaded to the printer adapter in the lookup table**).

Regarding claim 6: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: directing the RIP engine to communicate a status to the RIP manager indicating whether the RIP engine can perform the dynamic configuration in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 15, line 66-column 16, line 5; note that the job manager will route the second job associated with the block to a second virtual engine, having associated therewith four color print engines**); and

wherein the status determines whether the RIP engine or a different RIP engine in the pipeline will RIP the particular portion (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to portions**).

Regarding claim 7: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 6, wherein the status is a response message or a lapse of time (**column 22, lines 39-42; note that the different engines accommodate messages or time**).

Regarding claim 8: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: responsive to determining that the RIP engine cannot successfully RIP the print job in accordance with the RIP manager supplied

processing preference (**column 11, lines 1-3; note that when it is determined that a page has no color, it is processed by the B&W engine**);

identifying a different RIP engine that can or has performed such dynamic configuration of the at least one RIPing parameter (**column 11, lines 1-5; note that when a page has no color it is processed by the B&W engine even if the color engine has B&W processing functionality**); and

communicating the particular portion to the different RIP engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 11, lines 1-5; note that the B&W page gets processed by the B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 9: Zuber further discloses a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the method further comprises: determining that the RIP engine can successfully RIP the print job in accordance with the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 15, line 66-column 16, line 2; note that the job manger routs the B&W job to the first engine to be processed**); and

responsive to the determining, communicating the particular portion to the RIP engine for RIPing in accordance to the RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 16, lines 1-5; note that the color portion of the print job is processed with the color engine as the B&W portion of the print job is processed in the B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 10: Zuber further discloses a computer-readable medium having computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine stored thereon, the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for (**column 14, lines 37-43; note that the parser is able to sequentially output data to the print engines as needed**):

evaluating a print job to identify a set of RIPing parameters (**column 15, lines 52-58; note that the RIPing parameter includes color profile i.e. color/B&W**);

communicating the RIPing parameters to a RIP engine to direct the RIP engine to automatically configure its RIPing operations to conform to the RIPing parameters (**356-362, figure 12, column 15, lines 63-64; note that the B&W job is routed to the first engine**); and,

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 15, lines 50-60; note that when the print job has parameters as color/B&W and according to the parameter, the job router/parser routes the print job to the accorded configured print engine per the preference**), the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to different portions as desired to process by the color or B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 11: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 1 O, wherein the RIPing parameters indicate one or more specific RIPing algorithms, font resources, color profiles, and/or software versions (**column 15, lines 52-58; note that the RIPing parameter includes color profile i.e. color/B&W**).

Regarding claim 12: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for supplementing or replacing the RIPing parameters with one or more default RIPing parameters (**column 16, lines 1-5; note that the color portion of the print job is processed with the color engine as the B&W portion of the print job is processed in the B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 13: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for:

receiving a download request from the RIP engine, the download request identifying at least a subset of the RIPing parameters (**column 15, line 66-column 16, line 2; note that the job manger routs the B&W job to the first engine to be processed**); and

responsive to the download request, communicating resources corresponding to the at least a subset of the RIPing parameters to the RIP engine for subsequent installation by the RIP engine to configure its RIPing operations (**column 16, lines 1-5;**

note that the color portion of the print job is processed with the color engine as the B&W portion of the print job is processed in the B&W engine).

Regarding claim 14: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instruction for directing the RIP engine to RIP at least a portion of a print job using resource(s) associated with the RIPing parameters (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to different portions as desired to process by the color or B&W engine, note that the RIPing parameter is color profile i.e. both engines are using the same parameter**).

Regarding claim 15: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 10, wherein the RIP engine is a first RIP engine of first and second RIP engines in a pipeline (**figure 12, column 15, lines 63-65; note that the two virtual engines are heterogeneous with respect to each other**), and wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for:

determining that the first RIP engine cannot successfully RIP a print job in accordance with the RIPing parameters (**column 11, lines 1-3; note that when it is determined that a page has no color, it is processed by the B&W engine**);

responsive to the determining, automatically configuring the second RIP engine to perform RIPing operations in accordance to the RIPing parameters (**column 11,**

lines 1-5; note that when a page has no color it is processed by the B&W engine even if the color engine has B&W processing functionality); and

communicating a particular portion of a print job to the second RIP engine for RIPing, the particular portion having previously been assigned to the first RIP engine (**column 11, lines 1-5; note that the B&W page gets processed by the B&W engine**)

Regarding claim 16: Zuber further disclose, a raster image processor (RIP) manager computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-program instructions recited in claim 10 (**column 18 , lines 7-12; note that software is disclosed**).

Regarding claim 17: Zuber further discloses a computer-readable medium comprising computer-program instructions executable by a processor for automatically configuring a raster image processor (RIP) engine coupled to a RIP manager (**10, 12, 14, 16, figure 1, column 5, lines 14-24; note that the workstations are connected in a network with the print engines and column 14, lines 37-43; note that the parser is able to sequentially output data to the print engines as needed**), the computer-program instructions comprising instructions for:

receiving, by the RIP engine, a request to configure RIPing operations in accordance with one or more parameters specified by the RIP manager (**column 15, lines 52-58; note that the RIPing parameter includes color profile i.e. color/B&W**);

responsive to receiving the request, the RIP engine configuring RIPing operations based on the one or more parameters (**356-362, figure 12, column 15, lines 63-64; note that the B&W job is routed to the first engine**); and,

requesting the RIP engine to perform dynamic configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference (**column 15, lines 50-60; note that when the print job has parameters as color/B&W and according to the parameter, the job router/parser routes the print job to the accorded configured print engine per the preference**), the dynamic configuration being requested in consideration of the RIP engine RIPing a particular portion of the print job (**column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5; note that the print job is divided to different portions as desired to process by the color or B&W engine**).

Regarding claim 18: Zuber further disclose, a computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17, wherein the one or more parameters are associated with one or more of a particular RIPing algorithm, font resource, and/or software version (**column 15, lines 52-58; note that the RIPing parameter includes color profile i.e. color/B&W**).

Regarding claim 21: Zuber further disclose, wherein the computer-program instructions further comprise instructions for:

determining that computer resources of the RIP engine are insufficient to download and/or install one or more resources corresponding to the one or more parameters from an identified network address (**column 11, lines 9-16; note that when there is a problem configuring one or more parameters, the print engines are reconfigured to different engines depending on the need to print the job**); and

responsive to the determining, re-assigning and communicating a portion of a print job assigned to the RIP engine to a different RIP engine coupled to the RIP manager (**column 11, lines 24-34**).

Regarding claim 22: Zuber further disclose, a computing device comprising the processor coupled to the computer-readable medium as recited in claim 17 (**column 18, lines 7-12; note that software is disclosed**).

Claims 5, 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Zuber** (US Patent Number 6,035,103) as applied to claims 1 and 17 above, and further in view of **Morgan** (US Patent Number 6,362,828).

Regarding claim 5: Zuber disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager.

However, Morgan discloses wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager (**column 10, lines 22-27; note that data is downloaded to the raster engine**).

Zuber and Morgan are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. data rasterization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to efficiently rasterize data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Zuber with Morgan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 5.

Regarding claim 19: Zuber disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager.

However, Morgan discloses wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager (**column 10, lines 22-27; note that data is downloaded to the raster engine**).

Zuber and Morgan are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. data rasterization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein RIP engine downloads configuration resource(s) from a network address identified by the RIP manager. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to efficiently rasterize data.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Zuber with Morgan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 19.

Regarding claim 20: Zuber disclose all of the subject matter as described above except for teaching, wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine.

However, Morgan discloses wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine (**column 9, lines 13-21; note that the memory has data allocation segments**).

Zuber and Morgan are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor i.e. data rasterization. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skilled in the art wherein the identified network address is provided to the RIP engine by the RIP manager and/or stored in the computer-readable medium, which is local to the RIP engine. The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been in order to efficiently rasterize data. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Zuber with Morgan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 20.

(10) Response to Argument

Appellant, on pages 5-8, argues that Zuber does not teach or suggest, "a RIP engine is requested to perform configuration of at least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manage supplied processing preference."

In response: Appellant's assertions are incorrect. Referring to argument stated on page 5, ¶ [0003], says "routing a print job to a various print engines after RIPing does not means that the RIP engine is requested to perform dynamic configuration of a least one RIPing parameter when the RIPing parameter is not congruent to a RIP manager supplied processing preference", However, Zuber in **figure 12 and in column 15, line 50-column 16, line 5, note that unlike how the Appellant has explained, it is disclosed that the software RIP is operable to retrieve the multi-page document and RIP the document into separate pages, which the pages are separate and distinct and have associated therewith parameters that define the nature of the document as to printing i.e. color or black and white…then the job will get divided into two or more jobs based on the parameters. Thus, the separated jobs get sent to the 356 and 358 processors to be RIP processed before routing them to the engine. Such analogy is clear as the jobs are not just routed to the print engines without being processed first. And that, the RIP software is reconfigurable as they configure to process different color formatted job. Such teaching is also found on column 18, lines 30-41; it is disclosed the RIP software is operable to provide dispersed screening techniques and conventional halftone screening. Note that user is able to select which form of outlet is desired for any situation. It is inherent to have duplex mode such as processing color or black and white job**

dynamically as the job router analyzes the parameter as stated in the claim language. Also, it would be inherent to coincide/congruent the parameter of the print job with the RIP software as it would process the color and black and white differently with respect to the job by having to RIP configured to use, e.g., dispersed screening techniques or conventional halftone screening . Therefore, the Examiner relies upon the teachings of Zuber for rebutting of appellants' stated argument.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

Hilina S. Kassa

/Hilina S Kassa/

Examiner, Art Unit 2625

April 07, 2010

Conferees:

David Moore

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625

King Y. Poon

Supervisory Patent Examiner

Art Unit 2625

/King Y. Poon/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625